



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/764,476

01/27/2004

Koji Shimizu

118245

9140

25944 7590 04/16/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

AMADIZ, RODNEY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/764,476	Applicant(s) SHIMIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner RODNEY AMADIZ	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,057,589—hereinafter “Shin”) in view of Watanabe.

As to **Claim 9**, Shin teaches an electro-optical device comprising: scanning lines (**Fig. 4, X1-XM**); data lines (**D1-Dn**); pixels arranged corresponding to intersections between the scanning lines and the data lines to form a matrix (**210 and 212**); signal-supplying lines having first ends that are arranged close together and second ends that are arranged close together (**Fig. 5, 241, 243 and 245; Hr, Hg and Hb**); a selecting circuit (**Fig. 4, 240**) selectively supplying image signals to the data lines on the basis of selection signals supplied through the signal-supplying lines (**See Fig. 5, wherein data signal D1 is supplied to Y1, Y2 and Y3 on the basis of the selection signals (241, 243 and 245) and Col. 7, lines 9-41**), and the selecting circuit including switching elements (**Fig. 5, MR1, MG1 and MB1**) having first input-output terminals connected to the data lines (**Fig. 5, note connection to Y1, Y2 and Y3**), second input-output terminals connected to a node supplying the image signals (**Fig. 5, note connection to D1 through node**), and control input terminals to which the selection signals are supplied (**Fig. 5, note connections from 241, 243 and 245 to MR1, MG1 and MB1**,

respectively); and a selection-signal supplying device to supply the selection signals to the first ends of the signal-supplying lines (**Fig. 5, note signals HR, HG and HB coming from controller (not shown)—Col. 7, lines 9-41**), each of the signal-supplying lines including: an input terminal provided as the first end (**Fig. 5, note input terminal to supply the signal-supplying lines with HR, HG and HB—Col. 7, lines 9-41**); a first wiring line extending from the input terminal to the second end (**See lines 241, 243 and 245**); and a second wiring line extending from the first wiring line to the control input terminal (**See lines that connect 241, 243 and 245 to MR1, MG1 and MB1, respectively**).

Shin fails to teach that the first wiring line extends in the same direction as the direction that the data lines extend, and extending to the second end in a direction perpendicular to the direction that the data lines extend and the second wiring line extending in the same direction as the direction that the data lines extend. However, the specification shows no apparent benefits from having the first and second wiring lines extend in those specific directions. Therefore, having the wiring lines extend in specific directions is clearly a design choice based on the specific requirement of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to extend the wiring lines taught by Shin in any direction since extending the wiring lines in any direction would perform equally well at carrying and providing the intended signal.

Shin additionally fails to teach all of the signal-supplying lines having the same width; as well as the length being the same for each signal-supplying line from the first end thereof, through a portion of the first wiring and through the second wiring line, to

the control input terminal of the corresponding switching element. Examiner cites Watanabe to teach that the concept of having wiring lines of the same length and width is well known (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe (i.e. make wiring lines with the same length and width) in the electro-optical device taught by Shin so that each signal-supplying line, from the first terminal to the control input terminal, may be equal in load capacitance (**Col. 6, lines 45-48**).

As to **Claim 11**, Shin, as modified by Watanabe, teaches an electronic apparatus comprising the electro-optical device of Claim 9 (**Shin—See Fig. 4**).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant states that the Examiners' reason to combine Shin and Watanabe "so that each signal-supplying line, from the first terminal to the control input terminal, maybe equal in load capacitance" takes the claim out of context.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Watanabe clearly provides a reason for having signal lines of the same width and length. The Examiner has provided this reasoning as the motivation in combining Watanabe with Shin. Furthermore, Watanabe does not have to expressly solve the same problem as the Applicant intended, so long as there is an appropriate motivation to combine the two references. Lastly, the Applicant states that

“by arranging the signal-supply lines as recited in claim 9, there is an advantageous effect to increase the freedom in the arrangement of the input terminal and a selecting circuit.” The Examiner states that this arrangement is a design choice based on the specific requirement of the claim since the signals provided in the signal-supply lines travel from point A to point B regardless of the arrangement of the signal-supply lines. Furthermore, other arrangements can also lead to an increase freedom in the arrangement of the input terminal and selecting circuit.”

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RODNEY AMADIZ whose telephone number is (571)272-7762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/R. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
4/2/08